



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/520,004	03/06/2000	John Paul Maye	046436-5016	7731
21874 7590 03/19/2008 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				
EXAMINER STULIL, VERA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/520,004

Applicant(s)

MAYE ET AL.

Examiner

VERA STULII

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claims 2-21 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph has been withdrawn due to the amendments of claims received 12/14/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-15 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd, Jr. et al. (US 5,082,975) for the reasons given in the previous Office action mailed March 8, 2007.

The reference and rejection are incorporated as cited in the previous Office action.

Claims 7 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd, Jr. et al. (US 5,082,975) in view of Simpson (Synergism Between Hop Resins and Phosphoric Acid And Its Relevance To The Acid Washing of Yeast).

The reference and rejection are incorporated as cited in the previous Office action.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd, Jr. et al. (US 5,082,975) in view of Simpson (Synergism Between Hop Resins and Phosphoric Acid And Its Relevance To The Acid Washing of Yeast) and further in view of Todd, Jr. (US 4,002,683) hereinafter '683 Patent.

The reference and rejection are incorporated as cited in the previous Office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 8 paragraph 4, page 9 paragraph 3 and page 10 paragraph 2 of the Reply to the Office action mailed March 8, 2007, Applicant states that "The Todd examples do not show treatment of any media with alkaline hop acid solutions. Todd also does not disclose treatment pre-fermentation of the yeast growing tank, fermentation tank, fermentable feed or the yeast itself, which is an aspect of the instantly claimed technology". In regard to this argument it is noted that, Todd, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,082,975) disclose synthesis of hydrogenated purified beta acid (hexahydrolupulone) and its use as a selective inhibitor of cell growth (Col. 2 lines 33-41, Col. 3 lines 7-20). Todd, Jr. et al. disclose "[a] process for producing hexahydrolupulone which comprises of the steps of contacting beta acids in an alkaline solution with a metal oxide, hydroxide, or salt" (Col.2 lines 33-36). Todd, Jr. et al. disclose "the addition of hexahydrolupulone to a yeast culture to inhibit the growth of Lactobacillus therein" (Col. 3 lines 7-8). Todd, Jr. et al. disclose "the inhibition of a Lactobacillus microorganism in the presence of yeast without inhibiting growth of the yeast by the application of a Lactobacillus-inhibiting amount of hexahydrolupulone thereto" (Col. 3 lines 9-11). Todd Jr. et al. disclose "the selective inhibition of one microorganism in the presence of another by the application of an amount of

hexahydrolupulone which is inhibitory as to the one microorganism but not the other" (Col. 3 lines 16-19). Todd, Jr. et al. disclose that "[t]he resulting pure hexahydrolupulone is useful as a growth inhibitor in such forms as a stable alkaline solution in water" (Col. 3 lines 40-43). Todd, Jr. et al. disclose that "[s]imilar treatment of a 10% sugar solution, inoculated with yeast, did not inhibit fermentation. Accordingly, it is evident that the hexahydrolupulone solution may be used to selectively inhibit growth of specific cell lines, for example, the selective inhibition of Lactobacillus in the presence of yeast. Moreover, its use in inhibiting Lactobacillus infections in the brewhouse will become immediately apparent to one skilled in the brewing art. Other useful applications in fermentation processes, as well as pharmaceutical applications, will also be apparent to one skilled in the art" (Col. 8 lines 3-13).

In summary, Todd, Jr. et al disclose the inhibition of an unwanted cell growth (Lactobacillus) when adding a stable alkaline solution of hexahydrolupulone to a yeast culture, the fact that the treatment of a solution inoculated with yeast with a stable alkaline solution of hexahydrolupulone did not inhibit the fermentation, useful applications of such treatment techniques in brewhouses and various fermentation processes. Therefore Todd, Jr. discloses treatment of various media with alkaline hop acid solutions (Col. 8 lines 3-13). Todd Jr. discloses that addition of stable alkaline solution of hexahydrolupulone did not inhibit the fermentation, and therefore the alkaline solution is expected to be added prior to fermentation. Todd, Jr. discloses application of such technique in brewhouses and fermentation processes. Addition of hops/hop extracts to the wort during various stages of beer production was well known in the art.

Since Todd, Jr. discloses addition of stable alkaline solution of hexahydrolupulone to the fermentable solutions inoculated with yeast in order to inhibit the growth of unwanted bacteria in various fermentation processes, and since addition of hops to the wort during various stages of beer production was well known in the art, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the technique as disclosed by Todd, Jr. and to add a stable alkaline solution of hexahydrolupulone to the yeast and/or to the fermentable solution inoculated with yeast as disclosed by Todd, Jr.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 (page 8 paragraph 5, page 9 paragraph 3, page 10 paragraph 2 of the Reply), it is noted that declaration states that substitution hop acids for antibiotics provides a surprising and unexpected result (page 2 of declaration). However, antibiotics and hop acids are different compounds, with different means of interaction and inhibition of bacteria. Comparative effect of hop acids and antibiotics on lactic acid bacteria, level of inhibition of bacteria and other factors are not known. Therefore increase in fuel ethanol production due to substitution of hop acids for antibiotics can not be surprising and unexpected result.

On page 9 of the Reply (paragraph 2), Applicant states that Todd "does not disclose isomerised hop acids". In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). As stated in the previous Office Action, Simpson

discloses that hop acids present in the brewery yeast slurries have a bacterial action on lactic acid bacteria during the acid washing process (p. 405). Simpson disclose introduction into microorganisms of aqueous solution of "isomerised hop extract (ISOHOPCO2N, Pauls Hop Products, England) hopped to a level of 60° EBCBU" (p. 406). Simpson also discloses that solution contains 0-85% NaCl (p. 406). Thus Simpson discloses alkaline aqueous solution of isomerized hop acid. Simpson also discloses that alkaline aqueous solution of isomerized hop acid is maintained at 5° C (p. 406). As evidenced by Kaneda et al (Beer Absorption on a Lipid Membrane as Related to Sen Evaluation), the concentration of isomerized acids in ISOHOPCO2N product is 30%, in particular the concentration of isohumulone (isoalpa acid) is 21.6%. Since Todd Jr. et al disclose aqueous hop acid alkaline solution as a selective inhibitor of cell growth, and Simpson discloses that hop acids have a bacterial action on lactic acid bacteria and adding aqueous isoalpa acid alkaline solution to yeast, it would have been obvious to modify disclosure of Todd et al and substitute synthesized hexahydrolupulone with commercially available aqueous isoalpa hop acid alkaline solution (ISOHOPCO2N) as a cell growth inhibitor in order to simplify the process and avoid multiple steps of hexahydrolupulone synthesis.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding rejection of claims 12 and 13 (pages 9 and 10 of the reply), Applicant is referred to the response to arguments above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERA STULII whose telephone number is (571)272-3221. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am-3:30 pm, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VS

Application/Control Number: 09/520,004

Page 8

Art Unit: 1794

/Steve Weinstein/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794